DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 068 CE 038 881

AUTHOR	Krause, Scot; Parker, Gerald M.
TITLE	Proceedings of the National Study Tours on Military Preparedness (Seattle, Washington, February 22-23, 1984 and Fayetteville, North Carolina, March 14-15, 1984).
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	84
CONTRACT	300-83-0159
NOTE	60p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Armed Forces; *Educational Needs; Educational Resources; Educational Technology; Facilities; Government School Relationship; Military Science; Military Service; *Military Training; *National Defense; Postsecondary Education; *School Role; Technical Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Defense Preparedness; National Center for Research Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Under the general title of "Vocational Education's Role in Military Preparedness," two study tours examined existing relationships between vocational education organizations and elements of the defense establishment. Emphasis was placed on the benefits that could result from collaboration between the vocational education and military sectors as a contribution to defense preparations. The first study tour was held in cooperation with Olympic College, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and Fort Steilacoom Community College. The second tour was carried out in cooperation with the Fort Bragg Army Post, Fayetteville Technical Institute, Central Texas College, Central Carolina Technical College, and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. This report highlights portions of each of the expert presentations made at the study tours and other related discussions concerning defense preparedness. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED244068

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL STUDY TOURS

ON

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

Scot Krause

Gerald M. Parker

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

CE038881

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Applied Research and Development Supplemental Studies
Contract Number:	300830159
Project Number:	051AP30002/051AP30002A
Act under Which Funds administered:	Education Amendments of 1976, P.L. 94-482
Source of Contract:	U.S. Department of Education Office of Vocational and Adult Education Washington, D.C. 20202
Contractor:	The National Center for Research in Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210
Executive Director:	Robert E. Taylor
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination Prohibited:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity

Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education Project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD..... vi

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....viii

INTRODUCTION..... 1

The Benefits of the Study Tours..... 1

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S ROLE IN DEFENSE PREPAREDNESS..... 2

Vocational Education's Role in Defense Preparedness: Dr. Robert M. Worthington and Dr. Lawrence J. Korb..... 2

THE SEATTLE, WASHINGTON STUDY TOUR..... 9

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Olympic College..... 9

Fort Lewis Army Post, McChord Air Force Base, and Fort Steilacoom Community College..... 11

Clover Park Vocational-Technical Institute..... 12

Technology Exchange Center (TEC) and Orange County Community College System..... 13

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational-Technical Education, and Tinker Vocational-Technical Center..... 14

Mason Chamberlain Army Ammunition Plant, Mississippi State Division of Vocational Technical Education, and Pearl River Junior College..... 15

THE FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA STUDY TOUR..... 17

U.S. Department of Defense Military Accessions--Needs Assessment..... 17

Project Crosswalk: Linking Military and Civilian Occupational Information..... 22

Bendix Corporation and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville..... 24

U.S. Army Signal Center and Fort Gordon and North Carolina Department of Public Instruction--Division of Vocational Education..... 26

Naval Air Technical Training Center and State Technical Institute of Memphis (STIM)..... 28

U.S. Navy Damage Control Center and Community College of Philadelphia..... 29

Fort Bragg Army Continuing Education System, Central Carolina Technical College, Fayetteville Technical College, and Central Texas College..... 31

SUMMARY..... 34

APPENDICES..... 35

A. The Seattle, Washington Study Tour--Agenda, Participants List, and Program Presenters..... 36

B. The Fayetteville, North Carolina Study Tour--Agenda, Participants List, and Program Presenters..... 43

FOREWORD

Geopolitical realities and the development of microchip technology are changing this Nation's defense needs. First among those needs is a well-trained complement of persons capable of operating, maintaining, and repairing sophisticated weapons systems. Furthermore, the skills of those who operate the capital machinery engaged in the manufacture of these weapons systems must be significantly expanded and enhanced. Finally, the reality of defense preparedness depends critically upon the mutual concern and cooperation between the vocational education community and the defense-industrial complex in the United States.

This project was conducted by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education under the sponsorship of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. The purpose of this project was to bring together those persons interested in fostering collaborative efforts between vocational education organizations and the military-industry establishment.

This document is intended to provide a summary of some of the major points presented by program speakers at two study tours and ultimately will serve as a reference guide for cooperative programs currently underway.

This project was conducted by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education's National Academy for Vocational Education. Appreciation is expressed to all those

who participated in this project. A special thanks to Scot Krause, Study Tour Coordinator, Audni Miller-Beach and Mark Newton of the National Center staff, and Vicki Gaines, Marilyn Willhoff, and Gerald Parker for their assistance in preparing the manuscript. Final editing of this document was performed by Judy Balogh of the National Center's editorial staff.

I also wish to acknowledge the support, assistance, and counsel of the late Dr. Norman D. Ehresman, Dr. Howard F. Hjelm, and Col. William Scott. Dr. Ehresman was Director of the Division of Education Field Services, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky, and Col., U.S. Army Reerves. Dr. Hjelm is Director, Division of Innovation and Development, Department of Education and Chair, OVAE Defense Preparedness Task Force. Col. Scott is Acting Director, Training and Education, OASD (MRAL) MPFM/TE, The Pentagon, and a member of the National Center's National Advisory Council. These gentlemen contributed greatly to the success of the project.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project was an initial step in a broad range of activities needed to improve the defense preparedness of the United States. It is hoped that the examination of existing relationships between vocational education organizations and elements of the defense establishment will lead to an even more comprehensive association between these two groups.

Defense planners are concerned that the pool of technically trained persons be enlarged and the quality of their training be the best possible. It is widely felt that the benefits of collaboration between the vocational education and military communities warrant energetic efforts to broaden the awareness at the local level of the potential vocational education provides as a contributor to defense preparedness.

Two study tours, each entitled "Vocational Education's Role in Military Preparedness," were conducted by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education's National Academy for Vocational Education. The first study tour, held in Seattle, Washington, on February 22-23, 1984, was done in cooperation with Olympic College, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and Fort Steilacoom Community College.

The second study tour, held in Fayetteville, North Carolina, on March 14-15, 1984, was done in cooperation with the Fort Bragg Army Post, Fayetteville Technical Institute, Central Texas College, Central Carolina Technical College,

and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Division of Vocational Education.

This document highlights portions of each of the expert presentations made at the study tours and other related discussions concerning defense preparedness.

INTRODUCTION

The study tours were designed for those interested in identifying and/or examining firsthand the role vocational education plays in providing needed training to meet the special demands of the military services and defense-related industries. Through site visits and presentations from other exemplary programs, the participants learned about various programs offered within the area.

The Benefits of the Study Tours

Individuals attending the study tours benefited in the following ways: They saw examples of vocational education's role and capacity in providing training to the military services and defense industries. They were able to assess the pre- and postemployment technical, management, and administrative training needs of the military services and defense industries. They were able to identify planning strategies and program procedures to respond effectively and efficiently to the military's training requirements. They were able to identify major problems encountered in the linkage process and ways to solve them. They were able to focus on requirements for maintaining collaborative relationships between vocational education and the military services and defense industries. They were able to examine additional service, training, and research activities that may be shared by vocational education, the military services, and defense industries. They were able to share their experiences, plans, approaches, and concerns regarding collaborative relationships with the military and defense industries.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S ROLE IN
DEFENSE PREPAREDNESS

A videotape of a conversation between Robert M. Worthington, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, and Lawrence J. Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, Installations, and Logistics, U.S. Department of Defense, was presented as a part of each study tour. This conversation touched on current initiatives regarding military and vocational education cooperation. The following is a transcription of that discussion.

Worthington: Greetings from Washington, D.C. We're speaking to you this morning from the Pentagon. I'm Bob Worthington, Assistant Secretary of Education for Vocational and Adult Education. I'm talking this morning with Dr. Lawrence J. Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, and Logistics. Dr. Korb and I have been working very closely together since 1981 when Secretary [of Defense] Weinberger and Secretary [of Education] Bell exchanged letters and asked us to coordinate efforts on education and defense preparedness and training. We have jointly conducted a National seminar. As a matter of fact, I have a copy of the proceedings of that seminar, which was conducted in 1982, that is available. If any of you would like to have a copy of it, you can write to either of our offices. We're very pleased that a series of National study tours are being conducted by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education in Columbus, Ohio, in which many of you will

be visiting defense installations and talking to active duty military and others about the defense preparedness and how education can collaborate to improve our defense efforts. Dr. Korb, it's nice to be with you this morning.

Korb: Bob, it's nice to welcome you to the Pentagon and we're happy to participate with you in these study tours because we think it's very, very important, both for the Department [of Defense] and for the country, that we work together in this joint enterprise.

Worthington: As we have already established this joint committee to work together, and you and I will chair [it], we're sure that many good things will come out of this effort. We've asked persons from the State level at the State departments of education to establish committees at the State level. We're pleased to report that 45 States have already done that.

Korb: Well, we're very happy about that too. Because, you know, I don't think people sometimes understand the magnitude of the need of the Department [of Defense]--for educated people as well as the education that we ourselves provide. Let me give you some examples. We take in about 300,000 young people each year. We require about 90 percent of those to be high school graduates. We look for about 50,000 of them to be trained in specific technical and educational skills. Those skills are increasing each year. We're becoming a very sophisticated outfit in the Department of Defense, and we would like for more and more young people to have those skills. We have to do a lot of the training ourselves because people do not have those skills, and it would

help us and the country if those skills could be provided for those people before they come to us.

Worthington: As you know, the National Commission on Excellence, appointed by Secretary Bell, has pointed out that we do need immediately to make a major effort in our schools to upgrade the basic skills. And, we're trying really hard to do that. We're holding a series of meetings throughout the Nation--and one big National meeting in Indianapolis next month--in which we bring together the State legislatures, Governors, and others to point out the importance of having young people develop good basic skills.

Korb: We certainly applaud those efforts. We, ourselves, in the Department of Defense, are doing a lot. We have about 1.3 million of our 2 million active duty people actually in school right now. Some 750,000 are engaged in technical training that we provide. We have another 200,000 just catching up on the basic skills. We have some 600,000 youngsters either involved in finishing high school or taking voluntary college courses.

Worthington: We're very pleased that many of our technical schools, junior colleges, community colleges, and vocational schools are cooperating with the Defense Department and doing contract training. We're pleased that the report [proceedings from the 1982 National seminar], to which I referred earlier, lists some of those exemplary programs. We hope that more of those will sprout up around the country and work more closely with you.

Korb: Well, we think it's important. The Soviets put a lot of money into high-technology training and they're very concerned about this area. They're trying to push ahead and to use these skills a great deal for military applications. We don't think that the answer is just for more money. We think it [the answer] is better use of resources. And, that is why we like to cooperate with the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and vocational schools around the country. I think that we have an excellent program, for example, at Tinker Air Force Base where we contract with the local vocational institutions to actually provide the training for us. In addition to military people, the Department [of Defense] employs about 1 million civilians. We need them to have technical skills. We also have the defense industries. We rely on the private sector in this country to build missiles and planes, tanks and ships. We need people who have technical skills to go into those industries. Right now, there are shortages there. So, all across the board, we need training for our military people, the civilians who work for the Department, as well as those civilians who are going to work in the defense industries.

Worthington: I think another important example of the joint effort that we have been working on is the attempt to identify those skills to which our schools should be responding. For example, the report to the House Armed Forces Committee, a year and a half ago, pointed out that we're developing a serious shortage in critical areas. We're working through our National

Research Center to try to alleviate that shortage. We're trying to encourage young people to seek training in those skills where shortages do exist.

Korb: We certainly applaud those efforts. We need them because if we cannot have people trained in those skills, we cannot make up for the decade of neglect for our defense structure. We need more planes, missiles, and tanks, but we don't have the people to work on them. And, inadequate training programs will make it more difficult for us to get them even if money is there to spend. So, it is very, very critical for us. We, in the Department, try to help in that training. As you know, we have what we call our Tools for Schools program, where the Department actually loans the tools to the schools so that they can develop the skills of students. Right now we are spending about $52 million on that program and educating some 82,000 students.

Worthington: That's a worthwhile program. We wish more schools would take advantage of it. It really has helped a lot of schools get the equipment they normally would not have to do the type of training that we need today.

Korb: In addition, we have another program that we call our Adopt a School program. In this program, we have a unit on a ship, for example, that will actually adopt a school and go into the school and provide on a voluntary basis basic skill training for areas the ship might need--for example, mechanics or electricians. Also, the youngsters are taken out to the ship to see how those skills are actually employed in running a ship.

Worthington: We're also pleased that many of our local educators are taking advantage of facilities that exist out in the field. For example, utilizing National Guard Armories and Reserve facilities for training young people. We would like to see more expansion of that program too.

Korb: We think, as part of these study tours, that is certainly something we can look into. As you mentioned, people forget that in addition to our active installations we also have large numbers of Reserve and Guard units around the country. Those, too, are an important part of this effort because under our total defense concept we rely increasingly on the Guard and Reserve as a backdrop to the active Armed Forces. In fact, we could not go to war today without the Reserves.

Worthington: We hope that these State task forces that have been set up through our joint effort with the Defense-industrial base, the contractors in each State, and the active military, will encourage young people to look to the military as a career option. We hope that many of our guidance counselors have received working materials to use in pointing out more and more to young people that there is an excellent career option for them in today's military.

Korb: We certainly hope that's another backdrop or benefit of this program. We do need young people with increased technical skills, and we're very happy that you're supporting us with that effort.

Worthington: We're also pleased that we're working with some of the services in identifying instructional materials that have been developed as part of your excellent training programs that can be adapted to civilian use. We are finding that to be very helpful.

Korb: Thank you. We appreciate that. A well-educated society is a very vital part of our National security.

Worthington: I would like to say in conclusion that I hope that these study tours are as fruitful as we think they will be, and we look forward to working very closely in the future with Dr. Korb and his colleagues in the Department of Defense. Our best wishes to successful meetings.

Korb: Thank you very much for coming and thank you for the opportunity to discuss this with you today.

Worthington: It was my pleasure to be with you.

THE SEATTLE, WASHINGTON STUDY TOUR
February 22-23, 1984

In this section, highlights of the remarks of the program presenters are given. The agenda for this study tour and lists of program presenters and participants are given in Appendix A.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Olympic College

Following is a summary of remarks made by Henry Milander, president, Olympic College and Danny Haas, apprentice program administrator, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

Olympic College was founded in 1946 and the relationship with the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Apprentice School also began in that year. The number of apprentices involved in this program is over 1,000. Thirty-five trades and crafts are represented in the program.

The program is a cooperative arrangement between various groups including State government, Federal Government, Naval administrators, and union officials. There are nine full-time instructors from Olympic College at the Apprentice School every day.

Most of the programs take 3 1/2 to 4 years to complete. The course work credit can be applied toward an associate degree at Olympic College. The academic year (four quarters) at the Apprentice School is parallel with Olympic College. The Olympic College instructors teach in four different areas: math, English, physics, and mechanical drawing. The program has a very high attrition rate--for every 100 people who enter

this program, 71 graduate. The program is "front loaded." That is, the majority of the academic training is done in the first 2 years. The last portion of the program is, primarily, on-the-job training. This "front loading" is done so that those who are not qualified academically are identified as soon as possible.

Questions and Answers

Q: On the way over, I was talking to one of the other participants about the difficulty of matching faculty to a changing technology. Are all of your instructors protected by tenure and/or labor agreements, and is there a problem with keeping your instructors updated in changing technology?

A: They are, in fact, affected by changes in technology. They are, in fact, under a collective bargaining agreement, but they have the same opportunities that other faculty members have at Olympic College and they participate in those. Examples of these activities are inservice staff development kinds of things, sabbatical leaves, and so forth. They have opportunities to "get up to speed" in their particular areas. By the same token, our faculty members also go out in to the shops. They are not isolated up there in the Apprentice School. They do get down into the controlled industrial area; they do meet with those people; they learn about new things, equipment, and techniques that are coming online.

Q: Do you pay the apprentices? How does an individual get into the program? Can you use the G.I. Bill?

A: Yes, we pay the apprentice. Unlike the typical apprentice program, when the apprentices are in school, they receive whatever the wage is. A typical apprentice starts at $8.04 per hour. During the program, raises and promotions are given with satisfactory performance. At graduation, the apprentice is promoted to WG 10 step 2, which is a journeyman rate that pays $11.50 per hour. The application process starts with the filling out of standard form 171 and a supplemental questionnaire. The G.I. Bill benefits can be used.

Fort Lewis Army Post, McChord Air Force Base, and Fort Steilacoom Community College

The following is a summary of remarks made by Marion Ball, director, Military Programs, Fort Steilacoom Community College.

Fort Steilacoom Community College has been associated with military education since its inception in 1967. The original programs were basic education and GED. The activities now include associate degree programs in many different areas. The enrollment in the Fort Lewis program is 1,076, and at McChord Air Force Base, 850 persons are currently taking classes.

The military program at Fort Steilacoom Community College is an independent, nonstate funded, contract program. A fee, rather than tuition, is charged for each credit hour. The soldier-student pays the fee and then is reimbursed by the Army from 75 percent to 90 percent depending on rank and length of service.

The normal term is 8 weeks in length, but, this can be expanded or contracted to suit the schedule of individual Army units. This innovation has helped military personnel to complete courses they would not have been able to take otherwise. All courses are open to divilians on a space available basis.

Clover Park Vocational-Technical Institute

Following is a summary of remarks made by James Capelli, administrator, Vocational Education Programs.

The main focus of the Clover Park Vocational-Technical Institute is job preparedness and upgrading. Its relationship with the military began in 1943 with the training of military production workers. Programs are conducted both on the Institute's campus and the military bases.

The aim of several of the cooperative programs is to ensure that persons leaving the military are adequately prepared for civilian occupations. Specifically, a 6-month program was developed to prepare people for the exam required for an aircraft maintenance license. Another program prepares people to work in the telephone industry.

Clover Park Vocational-Technical Institute also operates a GED testing center in which 500 people a year are tested. The Institute also operates a family living program that assists military families in matters of home economics and child care.

Technology Exchange Center (TEC) and Orange County Community College System

Following is a summary of remarks made by Kathy Lusk, dean, Occupational Education, Rancho Santiago Community College, and Elaine McClanahan, supervisor, Brokerage Functions, Technology Exchange Center.

The Technology Exchange Center acts as a bridge between education and industry. That is, this partnership between the public and private sectors was formed to help students get from the classroom into the labor market and to help business and industry obtain appropriate training for employees.

Planning for the Technology Exchange Center began in 1981. Seven steps were taken in the development of this program:

(1) Local issues were defined. (2) A plan of action was devised. (3) A large symposium was held to inform people of the program. (4) The results of the sumposium were evaluated. (5) Suggestions from the symposium were implemented. (6) The start-up operation was began. (7) The full-up operation or the conducting of the ongoing activities of the program was undertaken.

The Technology Exchange Center is a nonprofit corporation directed by a board composed of education and business leaders. At the center, the staff meet with industry representatives and match their need for skilled employees with the community college or the regional occupational program that can provide training in the areas needed by that company. The staff then acts as liaison between the company and the educational institution to ensure that training occurs.

The ultimate goal of the Technology Exchange Center is to facilitate a process that will lead to vocational training programs being designed and delivered to user specifications in Orange County.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational Technical Education and Tinker Vocational-Technical Center

Following is a summary of remarks made by Jacqueline Cody, chief of training, Tinker Air Force Base.

A unique relationship has been established between the State of Oklahoma and Tinker Air Force Base. The Air Force base is responsible for the management of several weapons systems. The term "management" encompasses buying decisions, as well as decisions about repairing, manufacturing, overhauling, and storing weapons and ancillary equipment.

The vocational-technical program was designed to support the maintenance portion of Tinker AFB's mission. Originally, the apprentice program was administered by the military with a complement of 35 classroom instructors. Then, a program was instituted whereby the classroom instruction was contracted out to organizations such as the (FAA) and the State's vocational-technical department. After a time, the base administration abandoned the training program and met the maintenance personnel needs by hiring new people. This system proved to be unsatisfactory.

In 1978, plans were begun for a new training initiative. It was decided not to revive the apprentice program because of

various administrative difficulties. Rather, a program of classroom and intensive on-the-job training was devised.

The implementation of this program proceeded in three areas. First, the base's director of maintenance identified the critical skill areas and projected the number of people who would be needed over a 5-year period. Second, the Office of Personnel Management was enlisted to help provide sources of potential enrollees. Third, the State Department of Vocational Education provided assistance in the identification of candidates for training. The Tinker Vocational-Technical Center then was established with funds from the military and the State Department of Vocational Education.

The curriculum for the center was developed by an advisory board composed of journeymen and supervisors from each skill area.

The Tinker Vocational-Technical Center also contracts with community colleges in Oklahoma. This training includes associate degree programs in computer literacy and administrative science.

Mason Chamberlain Army Ammunition Plant Mississippi State Division of Vocational-Technical Education, and Pearl River Junior College

Following is a summary of remarks made by Travis Cliett, assistant director, Mississippi State Division of Vocational-Technical Education.

The emphasis of Cliett's presentation was on working with military contractors. Mississippi has developed an industrial

recruitment program in order to attract industries of all kinds into the State. This includes military and defense programs.

Training is an integral part of the overall industrial development program. Also considered are a company's needs in the areas of tax incentives, physical plant, and transportation. Most important here is that the State can promise a company comprehensive training services at no cost to the company.

After initial agreements are undertaken by all concerned parties, the preparation of the program is begun by State vocational-technical education staff. Industrial training coordinators have been established in every junior (community) college district in the State.

In the case of the Mason Chamberlain Army Ammunition Plant, training materials had to be developed, in some cases, for customized equipment built especially for this plant. The magnitude of the project was such that 7 to 9 technical writers worked at the plant site for approximately 1 year. The training program was developed in modularized form. Company officials were closely involved in the development of the curriculum.

The State of Mississippi will make a commitment to any industry that will come to the State for needed training. The delivery of such training is through the vocational-technical system, both secondary and postsecondary. The primary source of funding for this program is from the State government. Funds have also been allocated through the Job Training Partnership Act.

THE FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA STUDY TOUR
March 14-15, 1984

In this section, highlights of the remarks of the program presenters are given. The agenda for this study tour and lists of program presenters and participants are given in Appendix B.

U.S. Department of Defense Military Accessions--Needs Assessment

Following is a summary of remarks made by Steven Sellman, acting director, Manpower, Installations, and Logistics, U.S. Department of Defense.

Sellman focused his remarks on three topics: the current status of recruiting, the transitory nature of recruiting, and future recruiting requirements. He remarked that personnel levels of the military, civilians employed by the military, and other jobs related to the Nation's defense are authorized by the United States Congress. The Department of Defense has always been within 2 percent of that limit set by the Congress.

In his consideration of the current status of recruiting, Sellman remarked that, thus far, the 1980s have been good years for military recruiters. This is accounted for, in part, by the fact that when the Nation's economy declines and the number of civilian jobs is smaller, many people view the military services as a good employment alternative. But there is also evidence of a renewed patriotism--people are once again proud to wear a military uniform.

In 1983, the Armed Services exceeded their accession objectives. The quality of the recruits in 1983 was considered to be the best ever. Nineteen eighty-four is proving to be an even better year, both in the numbers of persons recruited and in the quality of those persons. The two main indices of quality in military accessions are the number of persons who are high school graduates and the number of persons who score at an average or above average level on the enlistment test.

It has been discovered that the high school diploma is the best single indicator of whether a person will be able to adapt to military life. In fact, a person with a high school diploma is twice as likely to make it through a 4-year tour of duty than one who does not.

In his consideration of the transitory nature of recruiting, Sellman noted that the effects of the end of the baby boom will be strongly felt during the next 15 or so years. The declining numbers of young people, and also the improvement of the Nation's economy, will make recruiting for the military increasingly difficult. Furthermore, other factors such as a congressional limitation on military salaries may also have an adverse effect on military accessions.

In his consideration of the future skill requirements of the military, Sellman remarked upon the increased sophistication of many military weapons systems and noted that the persons who will be needed to operate these systems will have to possess strong basic skills. Vocational educators can certainly assist in the

effort needed to produce such persons. In 1945, only 10 percent of military occupations required technical skills. In 1983, that figure increased to 30 percent.

Questions and Answers

Q: What is the retention rate of the military--in other words, how many people stay on in the military services?

A: Retention rates have improved over the last 5 years. The figure now is, that at the end of the first term of military service, roughly 65 percent of young people who are successful during the first term apply for reenlistment, and of that 65 percent, roughly 50 percent meet specific military requirements for entering into a career force and are allowed to reenlist. Those figures are as good as we have ever done.

Q: Have there been any recent studies that have looked at the reasons why people reenlist? Is there a single factor that shows why?

A: I'm not familiar with any specific controlled studies, but this is an issue of great interest to the Department of Defense and to Congress. I would describe the reasons for reenlistment primarily as follows. A sluggish economy drives reenlistments in the same way as it drives first-term enlistments. People looking for opportunity see the military as a pretty safe harbor for 4 years. At the same time, under the Regan Administration, there have been significant increases in military pay. That had not been true under the Carter Administration where pay had fallen even behind the basic minimum

wage that was being paid in industry. So, when pay increases became more attractive, enlistments rose. Finally, I think that there is a new attitude about the Military that is pervasive across the country. I think the American people are much more supportive of our young men and women today than they were 5 years ago. This is very important. I think people are proud to wear the uniform. They are not embarrassed at the prospect of reenlistment.

Q: I recently read that about 8 out of 10 high school graduates in the year 1994 would be required by the military to keep it at the same level that it is today. Also, 8 out of 10 would have to go into the community colleges and universities to keep their quota as it is today. Also, 8 out of 10 would have to be going into private industries to keep those people at the same levels to which they're accustomed. The question is, between now and 1994 do you think that there will be more cooperative working relationships between the Department [of Defense] and community colleges and universities to help overcome some of these problems in the near future?

A: We have a long history of close cooperation with a wide variety of educational agencies and associations. We work very closely with the American Council on Education and other National Associations across the country. This is not a new topic with the Department, for we do realize that we are going to be in competition. Higher education recognizes it and we recognize it. It would be in everyone's best interest to work cooperatively so

that we won't stumble all over each other. We have a person in the office of the Secretary of Defense whose primary job is to serve as a liaison between higher education and the Armed Services and to deal with just those kinds of problems. Given our past track record, my answer to your question is yes.

Q: What are the effects of the long-range contracting structure in the various areas? I see that the Navy is going to ask for 30,000 more young people this coming year. Do you see a certain percentage of those going back into the training command to do this training, or do you think the contracting structure or concept will be around for a while?

A: Training is not really my area, and so the answer that I would give to your question is my personal opinion. I think that you will see in the years to come an increased emphasis on the use of existing educational training facilities and capabilities within the civilian sector in support of training needs. There is a bill now pending in Congress that has to do with using community colleges to prepare people for possible entry into the military, specifically in technical areas where the military has certain requirements. I don't know what chances that particular bill has of passage, but I think it is only the beginning for cooperation between the military and education. Training is very expensive. We need a balance between the kind of training that has not been done by the military because of the military's requirements and the kind of training and education that can be provided by our present educational system. I don't know quite where the balance is, but I do believe that in the

years to come, you're going to see an increased effort to try to find one.

Project Crosswalk: Linking Military and Civilian Occupational Information

Following is a summary of remarks made by Anita Lancaster, Assistant Director, Accession Policy, U.S. Department of Defense.

Lancaster's remarks focused on a concentrated effort that is being made to link military and civilian occupational information. The general aim of this effort, which is called Project Crosswalk, is to provide an easily understood account of career opportunities in the various branches of the military. The need for such an account is pressing. Much confusion has been caused by the fact that each of the four military services has a different military occupational classification system. Also, there has not been a good understanding in the minds of many about the relationships between military and civilian occupations.

Project Crosswalk embodies two major purposes. The first purpose is to crease a taxonomy of linkages between military and civilian occupations. The second purpose is to find a way to use the database thus produced to generate some actual resources for people to use.

The nine-digit numbering system, used in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), was used as the basis of the Project Crosswalk taxonomy. It was felt that use of the DOT numbers would facilitate understanding of the taxonomy by civilian personnel and others. Military Occupational Specialties and DOT

job descriptions were matched and validated over a 6-month period by both military and civilian experts. This database will be updated annually.

Another product of Project Crosswalk is an automated tape that will be distributed to those with compatible computer systems. The tape lists 135 enlisted occupational areas and 75 commissioned occupational areas in a way that cuts across all of the services. The occupations are grouped according to the Standard Occupational Classification Structure. The National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee is working on several projects with the aim of integrating this information into State systems.

Furthermore, a hardcover book is being produced that will have information about the 135 enlisted occupations. The book will help youngsters who have taken the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery test to understand their capabilities in regard to qualifying for a given occupation.

Questions and Answers

Q: How about this book--will it be developed and released soon?

A: The book will be available and distributed probably through a joint service command called the Military Enlistment Processing Command. It is located in north Chicago on Green Bay Road. If you would write to us we would forward your letter to them to make sure that you are on the mailing list to receive a copy.

Bendix Corporation and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville

Following is a summary of remarks made by James Myers, dean of occupational education, Florida Junior College.

Myers offered comments on the general notion of cooperation between an educational institution and a private company. Florida Junior College and the area chamber of commerce were instrumental in the Bendix Corporation's decision to set up an operation in the Jacksonville, Florida area. Myers stressed that the cooperation between State planners and college staff is very important.

Myers enumerated the following "pointers" for those contemplating cooperative agreements: (1) Have at hand as many specifications of the company's product as possible. (2) Have as many specifications of the company's jobs as possible. (3) Obtain information on the anticipated staffing levels, that is, the number of anticipated hires. (4) Try to establish dates for hiring and training activities that are as definite as possible. (5) Involve company personnel as much as possible in the determination of faculty qualifications-this could involve the participation of company personnel in the interviewing of candidates for faculty positions. (6) All curriculum development should be reviewed and agreed to by company personnel. (7) A high-quality product is the aim of this entire process--quality control is very important.

Questions and Answers

Q: Does the student pick up all of the training costs?

A: After they are employed, Bendix foots all the cost. And, we do this on a very simple type of contract. Most industries and businesses are reluctant to enter into a firm contract. We do a lot of this by a handshake agreement.

Q: It seems to me that you were saying that it would be good to work closely with [State] economic development people to see who or what businesses may be considering coming into your area. Then, educational programs that could provide training would be an additional incentive for that business to come to your area.

A: Most people who are looking to relocate must expand their training. The problem is that a lot of chambers of commerce do not deal or work with their local training agencies. I personally think that this is a real big mistake on the chamber's part as well as with the educational institution. You need to be very aggressive in this area. It costs me money each year to become a member of the task force that works to bring new industry into the area. I go on visiting trips to industries thinking about coming into our area and tell them what we have to offer. You need to get on the committee so that when they [industries] talk about training needs you are there and available to talk about those areas and how you can meet their needs. If you can become the broker of educational information you will get more calls about additional training.

Q: Is there a key individual or group that one might approach in order to set up linkages with particular businesses or industries?

A: In larger companies, they have a human resource development person who is aware of all the human needs throughout the business. This person is usually at the director level. Sometimes it might be the training director.

U.S. Army Signal Center and Fort Gordon and North Carolina Department of Public Instruction-- Division of Vocational Education

A summary of remarks made by Robert Mullen, deputy director, Division of Vocational Education, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and William Kettner, The Signal School secretary, U.S. Army Signal Center and Fort Gordon.

This program involves approximately 35,000 students a year for advanced individual training. The students reside at Fort Gordon from 8 to 48 weeks. Of these students, 27,000 have just finished basic training and are coming to be trained in the signal area in the operation and repair of electronic equipment. There are 131 courses conducted on the base. The military perceives the fundamental benefit of this cooperative program with the State of North Carolina is that the student is able to determine his or her interests and aptitudes while still in high school. Because of this early exposure to electronics, the "wash-out rate" of the program is significantly reduced. The curriculum, developed jointly by the staff at Fort Gordon and instructors from North Carolina, is such that the students can go into any one of the four services.

This cooperative effort benefits both the military and the State of North Carolina. The military benefits because it has better-trained people entering the Armed Service; North Carolina benefits by being able to offer a pertinent curriculum that keeps students and instructors abreast of the latest developments in the field. There is also a benefit for students who pursue careers in private industry.

The milestones of this cooperative project were recounted as follows: (1) An organizational meeting was held in January 1983 at which time the need to train students by means of a joint effort was acknowledged. (2) Briefing meetings were conducted for personnel who were to be involved. (3) A curriculum was developed by military and civilian instructors. (4) Training materials were developed. (5) An evaluation plan was developed for use throughout the course of the program.

Questions and Answers

Q: What type of advanced placement is there available in the military? We have advanced placement in the community colleges and private industry, but I'm not aware of anything like that with the military.

A: Yes, it is there. They [young people] can come in and skip some of the basic fundamentals in electronic training. They can get through the program faster.

Q: Are the training materials competency-based?

A: Yes. North Carolina started the competency-based approach in 1972. We have developed many training materials using this approach and will continue to do so.

Naval Air Technical Training Center and State Technical Institute of Memphis (STIM)

Following is a summary of remarks made by Donald Fiene, head, Navy Contract Programs, STIM.

The State Technical Institute of Memphis was started by ex-military personnel. Its first contract with the Navy was a sole-source contract to train instructors. This program involves a staff of 300 instructors, mostly retired military personnel, and 30,000 students a year.

Information on military contract requirements can be found in the Commerce Business Daily. Also, organizations can request to be placed on the Department of Defense regional bidders' lists. The specifications in any Requests for Proposals received as a result of these activities should be reviewed carefully. Creative approaches to contract requirements are valuable, but one must support these approaches with a detailed proposal.

Questions and Answers

Q: Is there a variance in the classroom environment since you have civilian instructors who used to be active military personnel?

A: You might have in some cases or with some individuals. But, generally speaking, I don't notice that as making a great amount of difference.

Q: Where else is the Navy doing what is being done in Memphis?

A: Programs are being conducted in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania at the Great Lakes Naval Training Base, in San

Diego, California, and in Meridian, Mississippi.

Q: As a part of the equation that entered into your receiving the final award, do you believe that being a non-profit, State institution had any bearing?

A: Yes, it did. That was one of the major considerations when the contracting officer from Orlando came around and surveyed the institution. It was stated in the contract that the institution would be a nonprofit, accredited organization.

U.S. Navy Damage Control Center and Community College of Philadelphia

Following is a summary of remarks made by Brad Kinsey, coordinator, Navy Contract Program, Philadelphia Community College.

The Philadelphia Community College has a sole-source contract with the U.S. Navy to train enlisted personnel in damage-control procedures. This program had its origin in a meeting between college staff and U.S. Navy personnel from the Philadelphia Navy Base in the summer of 1982. At that time, the discussion centered on the Hull Maintenance Program conducted by the Navy's Damage Control Center. The program now includes many aspects of damage control.

The college staffs the program with a program manager, four supervisors, and 19 instructors. (The instructors serve on both full- and part-time status.) The program requires that instructors and supervisors have previous experience. Most of the staff, therefore, are ex-Navy personnel; seven of the instructors are not.

The curriculum for the program, parts of which are competency-based, was developed by college and Navy personnel in a joint effort. Evaluations have shown that the results of this program are very effective. In fact, student scores are higher than when the Navy conducted the program in house. Two factors seem to account for this. First, the quality of the current student is better. Second, the instructors' continued employment depends on good results; therefore, they take a strong interest in the students' progress.

Kinsey noted a problem in the selection of instructors at the beginning of the program. That is, many of the ex-Navy people did not know how to "sell" themselves. They did not know how to produce an effective resume. The problem was overcome by the use of extensive personal interviews. Another problem noted was a delay in the initial funding of the program. The college provided the means to finance the program during this delay.

Questions and Answers

Q: I have heard in this and the other presentations, that the quality of instruction has improved the programs such that they are now better than they were when the military ran the programs. How do you create this good environment where these instructors can adapt so quickly to this program and have the success that you are claiming with your instructors and with the military curriculum?

A: Let me say this--the difference between people learning and not learning many times is based on the amount of "caring"

exhibited by the instructors. The one thing that we try to do in all our programs is to encourage our instructors to show that they care about the students. Furthermore, these instructors are being scrutinized for more than the typical instructor on our campus. The Navy demands it and we want it too. Why? Because the students are being tested constantly. The results of this are a reflection of how well the instructors are doing with the students. When the students are not doing well, the instructor is not doing well. The attitude of the instructor is vital to the success of the program.

Q: How or what type of instruction is used during this 8-week training program?

A: It is a self-paced program. Those students who do not do well receive special instruction and/or assistance from the instructor. This occurs at each segment or part of the program. Thus, all students who are having problems can receive the best instruction when they need it most. We want those students to get personal attention all through the program and not at the end when they might fail. We constantly scrutinize the performance of the students. We spend the time to help the students pass the various segments of the training program.

Fort Bragg Army Continuing Education System, Central Carolina Technical College, Fayetteville Technical College, and Central Texas College

Following is a summary of remarks made by William Edmundson, director of education, Fort Bragg Army Post.

The program at Fort Bragg is known as the Army Continuation System. The Army Continuation System is to be found on every Army base throughout the world. The educational director, a professional educator, is responsible for providing training to enlisted personnel at each base.

The educational program at Fort Bragg occupies approximately 150 classrooms per day. The soldier at Fort Bragg can start an educational program and continue as far as he or she wants to go with the assistance of many different institutions that provide instruction at the base. Fayetteville Technical College offers day and evening classes to military personnel, including dependents of military personnel, civilian personnel who work on the base, and retired military persons, as well as the general public. The college also serves the needs of the military by offering an Adult Basic Skills Program through a curriculum styled after that of a high school.

Central Texas College has been at the Fort Bragg base for 2 years. Its role is to provide training to soldiers to improve skills first needed in Advanced Individual Training. The skills needed in the various Military Occupational Specialty areas must be refreshed periodically. Central Texas College provides this training and, by that fact, allows officers and noncommissioned officers (NCOs) to work with their units in other areas of combat readiness.

Central Texas College uses a large cadre of retired military personnel who have the in-depth knowledge and experience

to develop and conduct the training needed by soldiers at Fort Bragg. The instructors are certified by the Texas Educational Agency and the Military Training Board.

The program at Fort Bragg has been highlighted by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Defense as an exemplary program that provides high-quality instruction.

SUMMARY

This document highlighted the presentations made at two study tours that were designed to increase the awareness of the potential for collaborative endeavors between the vocational education community and the defense-industrial elements of the United States. Such efforts are needed to enhance the skill levels of persons engaged in various activities involving the defense of this Nation. It is hoped that the reader will use this document and communicate with the resource persons highlighted to establish partnerships between vocational education and the military and defense establishments.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The Seattle, Washington Study Tour - Agenda Participants List, and Program Presenters

Seattle, Washington
February 22-23, 1984

Agenda

Wednesday, February 22, 1984

8:00 - 8:40 a.m.	REGISTRATION	Cascade Foyer Westin Hotel
8:45 a.m.	DEPART FOR PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD (PSNS)	
9:10 a.m.	FERRY RIDE TO BREMERTON AND PSNS	
10:15 a.m.	REFRESHMENT BREAK	
10:30 a.m.	WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS Dr. Henry Milander President Olympic College	
	INTRODUCTIONS/STUDY TOUR OVERVIEW Mr. Scot Krause The National Academy for Vocational Education	
	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S ROLE IN DEFENSE PREPAREDNESS--Video-Tape on Current Initiatives Regarding Military and Vocational Education Cooperation Dr. Robert M. Worthington Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Hon. Lawrence J. Korb Assistant Secretary of Defense Manpower, Institutions, and Logistics Department of Defense	

Wednesday, February 22, 1984 Continued

11:00 a.m.	PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD AND OLYMPIC COLLEGE Dr. Henry Milander President Olympic College
12:00 p.m.	LUNCHEON AT PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD OFFICERS CLUB
1:00 p.m.	WELCOME TO PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD Captain Roger Horne Commander Puget Sound Naval Shipyard
1:15 p.m.	PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD APPRENTICE PROGRAM Mr. Danny Haas Apprentice Program Administrator Puget Sound Naval Shipyard
1:45 p.m.	TOUR OF PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD
3:35 p.m.	DEPART PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD
3:55 p.m.	FERRY RIDE TO SEATTLE
5:00 p.m.	ADJOURNMENT

Thursday, February 23, 1984 — St. Helens Room Westlin Hotel

8:15 a.m.	FORT LEWIS ARMY POST, McCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, AND FORT STEILACOOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE Marion Ball Director, Military Programs Fort Steilacoom Community College FOR LEWIS ARMY POST, McCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, AND CLOVER PARK VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Thursday, February 23, 1984 Continued

	Mr. G. James Capelli Administrator, Vocational Education Programs Clover Park Vocational/ Technical Institute
9:15 a.m.	U.S. NAVAL TRAINING CENTER AND SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
	Mr. Walter DeFelice Coordinator, Vocational Education Programs San Diego Community College
10:00 a.m.	REFRESHMENT BREAK
10:20 a.m.	TECHNOLOGY EXCHANGE CENTER (TEC) AND ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
	Kathy Lusk Dean, Occupational Education Rancho Santiago Community College
	Elaine McClanahan Supervisor, Brokerage Functions Technology Exchange Center
12:00 p.m.	LUNCH (On Your Own)
1:00 p.m.	TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL/ TECHNICAL EDUCATION, AND PEARL RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE
	Mr. Travis Cliett Assistant Director Mississippi State Division of Vocational/Technical Education
2:40 p.m.	BREAK
3:00 p.m.	OPEN FORUM: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR DIALOGUE
	Presenters and Participants
3:30 p.m.	SUMMARY AND EVALUATION
3:45 p.m.	ADJOURNMENT

Participants List

Jeanne Atkins
Staff Attorney
Women's Equity Action League
805 15th Street, NW
Suite 822
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-1961

Robert J. Bakewell
Instructor
Trade & Industrial Education
Olympia Technical
Community College
Olympia, WA 98506
(206) 491-2133

Earl Bowick
Department Chairperson
Trade & Industrial Education
Seattle Central Comm. College
1701 Broadway BE-0106
Seattle, WA 98122 (206)
587-6922

Einar Brosten
Fiscal Administrator
Helena Voc. Technical Center
1115 North Roberts Street
Helena, MT 59601
(406)442-0060

Joanne Butts
Parent Trainer
PAVE
1010 South I Street
Tacoma, WA 98405
(206) 272-7804

Duane K. Carlton
Associate Dean of Instruction
Olympic College
16th & Chester Avenue
Bremerton, WA 98310-1699
(206) 478-4545

Paul Chakonas
Associate in Higher
Occupational Education
New York State Education
Department
5B68 Cultural Education
Center
Albany, NY 12230
(518) 474-5705

Albert B. Chalupsky
Director
Behavioral Science &
Technology Group
American Institutes for
Research
P.O. Box 1113
Palo Alto, CA 94302
(415) 493-3550

Ralph L. Crist
Education Specialist
Education Liaison
Navy Recruiting District
Seattle
7500 Sand Point Way, NE
Naval Station Bldg. 30
Seattle, WA 98115
(206) 442-1474

Carl Ellis
Coordinator Off-Campus
Continuing Education
Olympic College
16th & Chester Avenue
Bremerton, WA 98310--1699
(206) 478-4641

Robert Evans
Dean of Instruction
Olympic College
16th & Chester Avenue
Bremerton, WA 98310-1699
(206) 478-4571

Leland Farley
Vice President
Director of European Programs
Big Bend Community College
APO New York 09111
(011) 49-671-72011

Barbara Gunn
Manager
Government Sales & Marketing
ITT Employment & Training Systems
3500 DePauw Boulevard
P.O. Box 68888
Indianapolis, IN 46208
(317) 875-7160

Robert P. Hand
Military Affairs Coordinator
Office of Provost
Cochise College
2900 East Cardinal Drive
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
(602) 458-4263

Clarence E. Haught
Director of Vocational Education
North Idaho College
1000 West Garden Avenue
Couer D'Arlene, ID 83814
(208) 667-7422

Thomas M. Healey
Director
University of Alaska
CREE Division
3605 Arctic Boulevard #320
Anchorage, AK 99503
(907) 564-3331

John House
Program Coordinator
Training Program Services Division
Employment Security Department
State of Washington
1007 West Washington Street
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 753-5250

Leonard Lamb
Director
Fairchild Center/Extension
Washington Community College District 17
92 CSG/DPE
Fairchild AFB, WA 99011
(509) 459--3786

Edmon Lee
Vocational Education Program Specialist
Planning and Research
Commission for Vocational Education
Building 17
Airdustrial Park
MS-LS10
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 753-5681

Wayne C. Moore
Instructor
Trade & Industrial Education
Auburn High School
800 4th Street, NE
Auburn, WA 98002
(206) 931--4899

Joseph A. Paolino
Guidance Counselor
Army Continuing Education Systems
DPCA-ED
Fort Lewis, WA 98433
(206) 967-3828

Cora Pinson
State Project Coordinator
Employment & Training Div.
Employment Security Dept.
State of Washington
1007 West Washington Street
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 754-1074

Jeff Robinson
Planner
Seattle OIC
15 22nd Avenue
Seattle, WA 98155
(206) 223-2852

William Simpson
Director of Continuing
Education, Extensions and
Community Services
Olympic College
16th & Chester Avenue
Bremerton, WA 98310-1699
(206) 478-4839

Phil Tullar
Vice-President/Provost
Sierra Vista Campus
Cochise College
901 North Colombo
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
(602) 458-7110

Program Presenters

Robert M. Worthington
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence J. Korb
Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, Institutions, and Logistics
U.S. Department of Defense
Washington, D.C.

Henry Milander
President
Olympic College
Bremerton, WA

Roger Horne
Commander
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard
Bremerton, WA

Danny Haas
Apprentice Program Coordinator
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard
Bremerton, WA

Marion Ball
Director
Military Programs
Fort Steilacoom Community College
Tacoma, WA

G. James Capelli
Administrator
Vocational Education Progams
Clover Park Vocational/Technical Institute
Tacoma, WA

Walter DeFelice
Coordinator
Vocational Education Programs
San Diego Community College Dristrict
San Diego, CA

Kathy Lusk
Dean
Occupational Education/Special Projects
Santa Ana College
Santa Ana, CA

Elaine McClanahan
Supervisor, Brokerage Functions
Technology Exchange Center
Garden Grove, CA

Jacqueline Cody
Chief of Training
Tinker Air Force Base
Oklahoma City, OK

Travis Cliett
Assistant State Director
Mississippi Division of Vocational/Technical Education
Jackson, MI

Program Presider

Duane K. Carlton
Associate Dean of Instruction
Olympic College
Bremerton, WA

Appendix B

The Fayetteville, North Carolina Study Tour - Agenda, Participants List, and Program Presenters

Fayetteville, North Carolina
March 14-15, 1984

Agenda

Wednesday, March 14, 1984

8:00 - 8:40 a.m.	REGISTRATION	Galary IV Room Entrance Holiday Inn Hotel
8:45 a.m.	WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	
	Major General Jack Farris, Jr. Deputy Commanding General XVIII Airborne Corps & Fort Bragg Army Post	
	Col. Frank Rauch Director of Personnel and Community Activities XVIII Airborne Corps & Fort Bragg Army Post	
	INTRODUCTIONS/STUDY TOUR OVERVIEW	
	Mr. Scot Krause The National Academy for Vocational Education The National Center for Research in Vocational Education	
	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S ROLE IN DEFENSE PREPAREDNESS--Video-Tape on on Current Initiatives Regarding Military and Vocational Education Cooperation	
	Dr. Robert M. Worthington Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education	

	Hon. Lawrence J. Korb Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, Installations, and Logistics Department of Defense
9:15 a.m.	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY ACCESSIONS--NEEDS ASSESSMENT
	Dr. Steven Sellman Acting Director Manpower, Installations, and Logistics Department of Defense
9:45 a.m.	PROJECT CROSSWALK: LINKING MILITARY AND CIVILIAN OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION
	Dr. Anita Lancaster Assistant Director Accession Policy Department of Defense
10:15 a.m.	REFRESHMENT BREAK
10:35 a.m.	CONTRACTS: A UNIQUE FUNDING ALTERNATIVE
	Mr. Frank Adams Provost College of Lake County
11:05 a.m.	BENDIX CORPORATION AND FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE
	Dr. James Myers Dean of Occupational Education Florida Junior College
12:00 p.m.	LUNCH (On Your Own)
1:00 p.m.	U.S. ARMY SIGNAL CENTER AND FORT GORDON AND NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION--DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Wednesday, March 14, 1984 Continued

Dr. Robert Mullen
Deputy Director
Division of Vocational Education
North Carolina Department of
Public Instruction

Dr. William Kettner
The Signal School Secretary
U.S. Army Signal Center and
Fort Gordon

1:50 p.m. — NAVAL AIR TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTER AND STATE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE OF MEMPHIS (STIM)

Mr. Donald Fiene
Head, Navy Contract Programs
STIM

2:40 p.m. — REFRESHMENT BREAK

3:00 p.m. — U.S. NAVY DAMAGE CONTROL CENTER AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. Brad Kinsey
Coordinator, Navy Contract
Program
Philadelphia Community College

3:45 p.m. — FORT BRAGG ARMY CONTINUING EDUCATION SYSTEM, CENTRAL CAROLINA TECHNICAL COLLEGE, FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL COLLEGE, AND CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE

Dr. William Edmundson
Director of Education
Fort Bragg Army Post

4:45 p.m. — ADJOURNMENT

Thursday, March 15, 1984

8:00 a.m. — DEPART FOR FORT BRAGG ARMY POST

8:50 a.m. — WELCOME

	Col. Frank Rauch Director of personnel and Community Activities XVIII Airborne Corps & Fort Bragg Army Post
9:00 a.m.	CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE PROGRAM Dr. Maurice Price Director Fort Bragg Branch
9:20 a.m.	TOUR CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE PROGRAM
10:35 a.m.	REFRESHMENT BREAK
10:50 a.m.	FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL COLLEGE PROGRAM Mr. Raymond Gatti Director Fort Bragg Branch
11:10 a.m.	TOUR FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL COLLEGE PROGRAM
12:20 p.m.	LUNCHEON AT FORT BRAGG ARMY POST OFFICERS CLUB
1:15 p.m.	OPEN FORUM: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR DIALOGUE Presenters and Participants
1:45 p.m.	SUMMARY AND EVALUATION
2:00 p.m.	DEPART FORT BRAGG ARMY POST--RETURN TO HOLIDAY INN
2:30 p.m.	ADJOURNMENT

Participants List

Robert K. Butler
Superintendent
Worcester Vocational School Department
Wheaton Square
Worcester, MA 01608
(617) 799-1941

W. Scott Coffey
Training Supervisor
Auto Body Repair
Nashville, TN 37206
(615) 226-3990

Donald Crist
Director
Center for AG/BUS/IND
Carl Sandburg College
442 E. Main
Galesburg, IL 61401
(309) 343-8088

Bruce A. Fritz
Training Administrator
Education Division, DPCA
Building 1009
Fort Ord, CA 93941
(408) 242-5909

Harold L. Gillis
Director
Vocational Education
Hoke County Board of Education
P.O. Box 370
Raeford, NC 28376
(919) 875-4106

James Joyce
Director
Lively Area Voc-Tech Center
500 North Appleyard Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32304
(904) 576-3181

Maurice Lacey
Managerr
Independent Study Programs
DANTES, Code 24
Dept. of Defense Activities
Pensacola, FL 32509
(904) 452-1084

Shirley McLean
Division of Professional Development
Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 770-7362

David A. Miller
Section Chief, Vo-Tech
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(301) 659-2568

Ernest Morine
Education Services Officer
Base Education
MCAS(H) New River
Building #312
Jacksonville, NC 28545
(919) 451-6680

John Rathkamp
Education Services Officer
Army Education Center
Building 179
Ft. McPherson, GA 30330
(404) 752-2843

Stephen Serman
Assistant Coordinator of
Off Campus Programs
Continuing Education Dept.
Thomas Nelson Community
College
P.O. Box 9407
Hampton, VA 23670
(804) 825-2965

Edward S. Shia
Education Consultant
Vocational & Adult Education
Connecticut State Department
of education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145
(203) 566-7484

George L. Stetter
Manager
Vocational Programs
Turner Job Corps Center
1604 Elmer Darosa Avenue
Albany, GA 31708
(912) 883-8500, ext. 200

Myrtle Stogner
Director of Vocational
Education
Richmond County Schools
Box 1259
Hamlet, NC 28345
(919) 582-5860

George W. Wood, Jr.
Education Service Officer
Army Education Center/
Fort Monroe
110 Coachman Drive
Tabb, VA 23602
(804) 680-2454

Program Presenters

Robert M. Worthington
Assistant Secretary for
Vocational and Adult
Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence J. Korb
Assistant Secretary of
Defense, Manpower, Institutions, and Logistics
U.S. Department of Defense
Washington, D.C.

Frank Rauch
Director of Personnel and
Community Activities
XVIII Airborne Corps and
Fort Bragg Army Post
Fort Bragg, NC

Steven Sellman
Acting Director
Manpower, Installations, and
Logistics
Department of Defense
Washington, D.C.

Anita Lancaster
Assistant Director
Accession Policy
Department of Defense
Washington, D.C.

Frank Adams
Provost
College of Lake County
Grayslake, IL

James Myers Dean of
Occupational Education
Florida Junior College
Jacksonville, FL

Robert Mullen
Deputy Director
Division of Vocational
Education
Department of Public
Instruction
Raleigh, NC

William Kettner
The Signal School Secretary
U.S. Army Signal Center and
Fort Gordon, NC

Donale Fiene
Head, Navy Contract Programs
State Technical Institute
of Memphis
Memphis, TN

Brad Kinsey
Coordinator, Navy Contract
Program
Philadelphia Com. College
Philadelphia, PA

William Edmundson
Director of Education
Fort Bragg Army Post
Fort Bragg, GA

Raymond Gatti
Director
Extension Education
Fayetteville Technical
Institute, Fort Bragg
Branch
Fort Bragg, GA

Maurice Price
Director
Extension Education
Central Texas College,
Fort Bragg Branch
Fort Bragg, GA